## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA CHARLOTTE DIVISION

## **DOCKET NO. 3:07-CV-00221-FDW**

RACING OPTICS, INC., BART	)	
WILSON, SETH WILSON, and	)	
STEPHEN S. WILSON,	)	
	)	
Plaintiffs,	)	ORDER
	)	
vs.	)	
	)	
DAVID O'NEAL, EDWARD M.	)	
WALLACE, and CLEAR VIEW	)	
RACING OPTICS, LLC,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	

THIS MATTER comes now before the Court upon Defendants' Motion to Seal (Doc. No. 65). Defendants' Motion is GRANTED in part and DENIED in part.

In their Motion, Defendants' seek to seal "(1) their Memorandum in Support of Summary Judgement Motion, (2) their Opposition to any Motion for Summary Judgement filed by Plaintiffs, and (3) Exhibits to the Memorandum and Opposition." Although Defendants' motion does not specify which of the exhibits they are moving to seal, the Court's review of the exhibits filed indicates that only five of the exhibits (exhibits K, N, O, P, and R) have been filed with the Clerk's office with instructions that they be sealed. The Court hereby GRANTS Defendants' Motion as to exhibits K, N, O, P, and R and directs the Clerk to place these exhibits under seal. In addition, the Court hereby GRANTS Defendants' Motion to seal their Memorandum in Support of Summary Judgment, but only does so subject to Defendants' filing of a redacted version of the memorandum that is available to the public. Finally, the Court DENIES Defendants' Motion as to any future

filings as premature. Defendants may, of course, move to seal future exhibits at the time that they are filed.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Signed: December 5, 2007

Frank D. Whitney

United States District Judge